

Pairing, Stripes, Lattice Distortions and Superconductivity in Cuprate Oxides

A. H. Castro Neto

Department of Physics, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521

(February 1, 2008)

Proceedings of the MTSC 2000

Klosters, Switzerland

April 1, 2000.

Abstract

We propose a model for a spatially modulated collective state of superconducting cuprates in which the electronic properties vary locally in space. In this model the regions of higher hole density (called stripes) are described as Luttinger liquids and the regions of lower density (antiferromagnetic ladders) as an interacting bosonic gas of $d_{x^2-y^2}$ hole pairs. We show that the transition to the superconducting state is topological and driven by decay processes among these elementary excitations in the presence of vibrations.

The experimental evidence for charge and spin inhomogeneities in superconducting cuprates has been accumulating over the last few years¹. It is believed that these inhomogeneities are the result of strong competing electron-electron and electron-lattice interactions. The strong interactions can be hinted from the fact that cuprates are directly related to Mott insulators and not to metals. There is an emerging point of view that inhomogeneities may be at the heart of the superconducting problem and that an important part of the physics occurs in real space. This should be contrasted with a Fermi liquid description which is dominated by the Fermi surface. In this work we propose a model for superconductivity which requires a dual description in terms of real and momentum space.

We assume the existence of two main length scales in the problem. At the short length scales the physics is dominated by the strong Coulomb forces associated with the Mott insulator². These forces lead to the quantum confinement of holes³. An example of such confinement happens when two holes are injected into an antiferromagnet and there is a gain in magnetic and kinetic energy if they move together instead of separately. This leads to the formation of bound states of two holes which due to the same strong Coulomb forces and lattice symmetry have $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry³. On the other hand, in the presence of magnetic defects such as anti-phase domain walls one-dimensional (1D) structures such as “stripes” can be stabilized due to the gain of *single* hole kinetic energy⁴. Stripes are regions of larger carrier density which have properties analogous to the ones found in low-dimensional interacting Fermi systems such as Luttinger liquids⁵. In this case a long length scale associated with the inter-stripe distance emerges leading to a phase with long-range orientational order in the absence of translational order, that is, a state similar to a classical liquid crystal⁶. In fact, because the charge modulated state (CMS) is composed of electrons we expect this modulated phase to be quantum in nature, that is, a quantum liquid crystal⁷.

Let us consider a static CMS induced along the y direction in the 2D system with periodicity Na where a is the lattice spacing. We assume that the CMS is a superposition of a dilute homogeneous bosonic background of $d_{x^2-y^2}$ hole pairs in 2D and a set of 1D Luttinger liquids. This picture is supported by density matrix renormalization group (DMRG)

calculations of the $t - J$ model^{11,12}. In fact, weak disorder¹³, spin-orbit effects and lattice distortions¹⁴ might stabilize density modulations even further. The CMS is such that bosons are continuously created and destroyed from the Luttinger liquids. In the absence of coupling between such excitations the system should be insulating even in the presence of the smallest amount of disorder: a Bose glass of pairs⁸ and a charge density wave state (CDW)⁵ on the stripes (we assume repulsive interactions only). Deformations of the amplitude of the density of the CMS are always energetically costly. Therefore, phase fluctuations are the low energy excitations in such systems. Moreover, charge neutrality implies that a CMS has to be coupled to the lattice. Therefore fluctuations of the CMS should appear directly into the phonon spectrum. We believe that this has been observed experimentally in essentially all the cuprates^{9,10}. The mechanism for superconductivity discussed in this work requires the coupling of stripe fermions via the exchange of bosons. One can think of this mechanism as the exchange of stripe “pieces”. The simplest exchange mechanism is due to the decay of these bosons into fermionic degrees of freedom at the stripes. We find, however, that the decay process requires the production of lattice vibrations. As a natural consequence, superfluid vortices are coupled to dislocations of the CMS. Because the superfluid density is low, the interactions between topological defects ultimately determine the phase diagram¹⁵.

We assume the existence of bosons with energy $E_{\mathbf{k}}$ and local repulsion U described by creation (annihilation) operators $P_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}$ ($P_{\mathbf{k}}$) and fermions with energy dispersion $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ and spin σ ($\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$) described by creation (annihilation) operators $\psi_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^{\dagger}$ ($\psi_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$). When $N \gg 1$ the direct exchange of fermions between stripes is suppressed and we can describe the fermions as isolated 1D Luttinger liquids. In this limit it is convenient to label the fermion operators as $\psi_{n,\alpha,\sigma}(x)$ where n is the stripe label, $\alpha = R, L$ refers to right and left moving fermions⁵. On the one hand, bound states of two holes are not eigenstates of the Luttinger liquid. On the other hand, collective sound waves of the Luttinger liquid are not elementary excitations of the weakly doped Mott insulator. Thus, the simplest process which couples these two types of excitations is a decay process. The decay produces a “shake” of the collective state emitting phonons. Conservation of linear and angular momentum requires the coupling

between fermions and bosons to have the form (we use units such that $\hbar = k_B = 1$ and $\beta = 1/T$):

$$H_c = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}} V_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q}) \lambda_{\mathbf{p}} P_{\mathbf{k}} \psi_{\mathbf{q}, \uparrow} \psi_{-\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}, \downarrow} b_{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger} + h.c. . \quad (1)$$

where $b_{\mathbf{p}}$ ($b_{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger}$) is the annihilation (creation) operators for vibrations of the collective state (including the lattice). Here $\lambda_p \rightarrow 0$ when $p \rightarrow 0$ is the stripe-vibration coupling constant (the momentum dependence is a consequence of the local coupling of the bosons with the stripes), $V_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q})$ is the boson-stripe coupling which, by conservation of angular momentum, has the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry. Notice that to destroy a boson is equivalent to create two electrons in the antiferromagnetic ladder. In fact, (1) is very similar to fermion-boson models which have appeared in the literature of superconductivity over the years¹⁶. It is straightforward to see from (1) that the condensation of the bosons with simultaneous condensation of fermions into Cooper pairs with zero center of mass momentum requires superfluidity and lattice distortions to occur at the same wave-vector. In particular, the largest coupling occurs at the edge of the Brillouin zone with wave-vector $\mathbf{K} = (0, \pm\pi/a)$ and thus perpendicular to the orientation of the charge modulation (that is, perpendicular to the “stripes”). In the case of the formation of domains with stripes running in orthogonal directions we also expect response at $\mathbf{K}^* = (\pm\pi/a, 0)$. If we forget about the phase fluctuations we would find a superfluid/superconducting phase with simultaneous dimerization of the CMS perpendicular to its orientation. This result would be in agreement with the *simultaneous* appearance of the pseudogap in angle resolved photoemission experiments¹⁷ (ARPES) and the phonon anomalies observed in neutron scattering¹⁰ exactly at $\mathbf{K}$. We stress that although vibrations are not the mechanism of pairing (which is essentially produced the electron-electron interactions), they are essential for condensation.

Because we are discussing a 2D system with low superfluid density the problem of superconductivity is decided by phase fluctuations. Consider the partition function of the problem which can be written in terms of an Euclidean Lagrangian L . We can separate the problem into fast and slow moving fields by linearizing the fermion dispersion close to

the stripe Fermi surface and studying the bosons and lattice distortions close to $\mathbf{K}$. We disregard all the fast oscillating terms in the Euclidean action and rewrite the Lagrangian as $L = L_0[P, b] + \sum_n L_S[\psi_n] + L_C$ where

$$L_0[P, b] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2r \left\{ \bar{P}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\partial_\tau + E_0 - \frac{\nabla^2}{2M_B} \right) P(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{U}{2} N^2(\mathbf{r}) + \bar{b}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\partial_\tau + \omega_0 - \frac{\nabla^2}{2M_V} \right) b(\mathbf{r}) \right\} \quad (2)$$

where E_0 (ω_0) is the energy of the bosons (vibration) at $\mathbf{K}$, M_B is the effective boson mass, M_V is the mass associated with the vibrations and $N(\mathbf{r})$ is the local number of bosons, L_S is the Lagrangian for interacting fermions in 1D⁵ and

$$L_C = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \int dx V(x, n) \left[P(x, n) \bar{b}(x, n) + P(x, n) \bar{b}(x, n) \right] [\psi_{n,R,\uparrow}(x) \psi_{n,L,\downarrow}(x) + \psi_{n,L,\downarrow}(x) \psi_{n,R,\uparrow}(x)] + c.c. \} \quad (3)$$

is the boson-stripe-vibration coupling. We now redefine fields as $P = \sqrt{\sigma_B} e^{-i\varphi_B}$ and $b = \sqrt{\sigma_V} e^{i\varphi_V}$ and use the bosonization technique⁵ in order to get $L = \sum_n L_{1D}[\theta_{n,\rho}, \phi_{n,s}] + \sum_{\alpha=B,V} L_\alpha[\sigma_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha] + L_C[\sigma_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha, \theta_\rho, \phi_s]$ where $L_{1D}[\theta_{n,\rho}, \phi_{n,s}]$ is the action for 1D bosons (θ_ρ and ϕ_s are the charge and spin bosonic modes at the stripes)⁵ and

$$L_\alpha = \int d^2r \left[i\sigma_\alpha \partial_\tau \varphi_\alpha + E_\alpha \sigma_\alpha + \frac{U_\alpha}{2} \sigma_\alpha^2 + \frac{\sigma_\alpha^{-1}}{8M_\alpha} (\nabla \sigma_\alpha)^2 + \frac{\sigma_\alpha}{2M_\alpha} (\nabla \varphi_\alpha)^2 \right] \quad (4)$$

with $E_B = E_0$, $E_V = \omega_0$, $U_B = U$ and $U_V = 0$. Finally,

$$L_C = \sum_n \int \frac{dx}{2\pi a} V(x, nNa) \sqrt{\sigma_B \sigma_V} e^{-i(\varphi_B(x, nNa) + \varphi_V(x, nNa) - \sqrt{2\pi} \theta_{n,\rho}(x))} \cos(\sqrt{2\pi} \phi_{n,s}(x)) + c.c. \quad (5)$$

We can gauge away the phase fields and define a new bosonic field θ_c such that $\theta_{n,c}(x) = \theta_{n,\rho}(x) - (\varphi_B(x, nNa) + \varphi_V(x, nNa))/\sqrt{2\pi}$ so that L_C simplifies to

$$L_C = \sum_n \int \frac{dx}{\pi a} V(x, nNa) \sqrt{\sigma_B \sigma_V} \cos(\sqrt{2\pi} \theta_{n,c}(x)) \cos(\sqrt{2\pi} \phi_{n,s}(x)). \quad (6)$$

Because of the gauge transformation a new term appears in the Lagrangian:

$$L_I[\varphi] = \sum_n \int dx \left\{ \frac{K_\rho}{4\pi v_\rho} [(\partial_\tau(\varphi_B(x, n) + \varphi_V(x, n)))^2 + v_\rho^2 (\partial_x(\varphi_B(x, n) + \varphi_V(x, n)))^2] + \frac{K_\rho}{\sqrt{2\pi} v_\rho} [\partial_\tau(\varphi_B(x, n) + \varphi_V(x, n)) \partial_\tau \theta_{n,c}(x) + v_\rho^2 \partial_x(\varphi_B(x, n) + \varphi_V(x, n)) \partial_x \theta_{n,c}(x)] \right\} \quad (7)$$

Here K_ρ is the Luttinger parameter and v_ρ the charge velocity. We can study the phase fluctuations around the saddle point where: $\sigma_\alpha = \sigma_\alpha^0$, $\varphi_\alpha = 0$ with $\alpha = B, V$. This just gives the mean field solution which will be studied elsewhere¹⁸. This mean field solution produces a characteristic temperature T^* below which superfluidity and lattice distortions start to be simultaneously generated at $\mathbf{K}$. This temperature, however, is not the actual transition temperature since the phases of the order parameters fluctuate strongly. T^* is a crossover temperature which we associate with the so-called pseudogap phase of the cuprates¹⁹. Around the saddle point we can easily show that L_C in (6) is a relevant operator in a renormalization group sense even in the presence of strong repulsion. Thus, even if *isolated* stripes are deep inside of a CDW state the coupling V drives the system to a superconducting state. Amplitude fluctuations around the saddle point are therefore massive and produce a spin gap in the system. Integrating over amplitude fluctuations up to second order leads to an Euclidean action of the form:

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^2r \left\{ \sum_{\alpha=B,V} \left[i\bar{\sigma}_\alpha \partial_\tau \varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, \tau) + \frac{\kappa_\alpha}{4} (\partial_\tau \varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, \tau))^2 + \frac{\sigma_\alpha}{M_\alpha} (\nabla \varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, \tau))^2 \right] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{K_\rho}{2\pi v_\rho N a} \left[\left(\sum_{\alpha=B,V} \partial_\tau \varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, \tau) \right)^2 + v_\rho^2 \left(\sum_{\alpha=B,V} \partial_x \varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, \tau) \right)^2 \right] \right\} \quad (8)$$

where the factor of $1/N$ appears due to the coarse-graining of the fields in the direction perpendicular to the stripes. Here $\bar{\sigma}_B$ is the total density of electrons in the system, κ_B is the charge compressibility (the superfluid velocity is given by $c_B = 4\sigma_B/(\kappa_B M_B)$), $\bar{\sigma}_V = 0$ and κ_V is the lattice compressibility (the sound velocity is $c_V = 4\sigma_V/(\kappa_V M_V)$). The key point about (8) is that the topological excitations of the superfluid state (the vortices) are directly coupled to the topological excitations of the dimerized CMS (the dislocations loops) via the stripes.

Let us consider now the problem at $0 < T < T^*$ so that the amplitude of the order parameters are well developed but phase coherence has not been established yet. At finite temperatures we can disregard the time derivatives in (8) and rewrite

$$S = \frac{\beta}{2} \int d^2r \left\{ \sum_{\alpha=B,V} \frac{\sigma_\alpha}{M_\alpha} (\nabla \varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}))^2 + \frac{v_F}{2\pi Na} \left(\sum_{\alpha=B,V} \partial_x \varphi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \right)^2 \right\} \quad (9)$$

which describes two 2D XY models coupled along the x direction (v_F is the stripe Fermi velocity). In what follows we will study the problem of phase coherence due to the renormalization of one of the phase modes by the gaussian modes of the other. This procedure works when the coupling is very weak, that is, $N \gg 1$. Because of the quadratic nature of the action it is a simple exercise to show that the problem is described by a 2D XY model with renormalized stiffness. In the superfluid case the stiffness is given by

$$\rho_B = (E_B + E_V) \left[1 + \frac{E_V/E_B}{\sqrt{1 + E_C (E_B^{-1} + E_V^{-1})}} \right]^{-1} \quad (10)$$

where $E_\alpha = \sigma_\alpha/M_\alpha$ and $E_C = v_F/(2\pi Na)$. An analogous result is obtained for the rigidity of the vibrations with the replacement of E_B by E_V and vice-versa. Therefore, we conclude that the transition from the ordered to the disordered phase of the superfluid or/and the dimerized CMS is due to the unbinding of the topological excitations: vortex-antivortex pairs in the case of the superfluid and dislocation loops of the dimerized CMS. In fact these topological excitations are coupled since a dislocation of the dimerized CMS can potentially liberate vortex-antivortex pairs. The transition temperature to the ordered phase can now be estimated directly from (10) as

$$T_{c,\alpha} \approx \frac{\pi}{2} \rho_\alpha \quad (11)$$

in accord with the Uemura relation²⁰. An interesting consequence of our calculations is that if the phonon at $\mathbf{K}$ is optical (dispersionless) then $E_V \rightarrow 0$ and $\rho_V \rightarrow 0$. In this case the transition to the CMS is driven to zero temperature! Thus, while the system becomes a superfluid-superconductor at $T_{c,B}$, at any finite temperature dislocations loops of the dimerized CMS will render $T_{c,V} = 0$.

In summary, we have proposed a 2D model for superconducting order in cuprates which involve a spatially modulated collective state which contains $d_{x^2-y^2}$ bosons and stripe

fermions. We show that the coupling between these particles leads to superconductivity and simultaneous condensation of bosons and phonons at finite wave-vector. Although condensation starts at high temperature T^* , phase coherence is only attained at low temperatures due to proliferation of vortex-antivortex pairs of the superfluid and dislocation loops of a dimerized CMS.

I would like to acknowledge fruitful conversations with A. Balatsky, S. Billinge, A. R. Bishop, A. Chernyshev, T. Egami, L. Pryadko, R. McQueeney, D. MacLaughlin and J. Zaanen. I acknowledge partial support from a Los Alamos CULAR grant under the auspices of the U. S. Department of Energy.

REFERENCES

- ¹ S-W. Cheong *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1791 (1991); J. H. Cho *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 222 (1993); F. C. Chou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2323 (1993); F. Borsa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 7334 (1995).
- ² N. F. Mott in *Metal-Insulator Transitions* (Taylor & Francis, London, 1974).
- ³ E. Dagotto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 763 (1994) and references therein.
- ⁴ A. L. Chernyshev, A. H. Castro Neto, A. R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. Lett **84**, 4922 (2000).
- ⁵ For a review, see, J. Voit, Rep. Prog. Phys. **58**, 977 (1995).
- ⁶ P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- ⁷ S. A. Kivelson, E. Fradkin and V. J. Emery, Nature **393**, 550 (1998).
- ⁸ M. P. A. Fisher *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 546 (1989).
- ⁹ A. Bianconi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 12018 (1996); G. M. Zhao *et al.*, Nature **385**, 236 (1997).
- ¹⁰ R. J. McQueeney *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 628 (1999); R. J. McQueeney *et al.*, cond-mat/9907211; Y. Petrov *et al.*, cond-mat/0003414; S. J. L. Billinge *et al.*, cond-mat/0005032.
- ¹¹ S. R. White and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1272 (1998); *ibid.* **81**, 3227 (1998).
- ¹² G. B. Martins, *et al.*, cond-mat/0004316.
- ¹³ N. Hasselmann *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2135 (1999).
- ¹⁴ J. M. Tranquada *et al.*, Nature, **375**, 561 (1995).
- ¹⁵ J. Zaanen and Z. Nussinov, cond-mat/0006193.

¹⁶ See, for instance, Y. B. Rumer, *Jetp* **10**, 409 (1960) and for a more recent rediscovery of the model: V. B. Geshkenbein, L. B. Ioffe and A. I. Larkin, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 3173 (1997).

¹⁷ D. S. Marshall *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 4841 (1996).

¹⁸ A. H. Castro Neto, unpublished.

¹⁹ J. L. Tallon and J. W. Loram, *cond-mat/0005063*.

²⁰ Y. J. Uemura, *Physica C* **282**, 194 (1997).